

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated August 17, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

The abstract stands objected to for being longer than 150 words. Applicants have provided a new abstract that is less than 150 words.

The specification stands objected to for various typographical issues. Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

The drawings stand objected to for lacking reference numbers mentioned in the description. Applicants have amended FIG. 2 as suggested by the Examiner, and have removed reference numbers 36 and 38 previously in FIG. 2 to avoid double use of these reference numbers.

Claims 29, 31, and 35 stand objected to because of various informalities. Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner (except that Applicants amended claim 31, line 16 to recite “provided,” not “providing” as suggested by the Examiner as Applicants believe that “provided” is correct).

Claims 1 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0054090 A1 (Silva). Applicant respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Silva.

Silva is directed to creating and providing personalized access to web content and services from terminals having diverse capabilities. Silva discusses a method for selecting content in web pages for download. Page 8, paragraph 67, line 1 – page 9, paragraph 67, line 18. The user uses a graphical user interface (GUI) to select content, and the user’s actions are recorded by a recording applet. The user’s interaction is through the user’s desktop machine, e.g., mouse clicks and keyboard entry.

Silva does not teach, disclose, or suggest at least creating a bookmark to a location in a voice application in accordance with vocal input provided to the voice application as recited in independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method for providing a bookmark in a voice application where a user is allowed to provide vocal input to the voice application and a bookmark is created in accordance with the vocal input. Conversely, Silva discusses recording “navigation actions” by a user using a desktop machine to extract desired web content for later replay through a VoiceXML transcoder. Page 9, paragraph 67, lines 10-12 and 28-29. These navigation actions

include button clicks and selections from pull-down menus that are clearly GUI interactions. Page 9, paragraph 67, lines 14-15. The method recited in claim 1 allows a user to interact with a voice application vocally to provide input, which is not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Silva. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Silva for at least these reasons.

Independent claim 23 is also patentable over Silva. Independent claim 23 recites an article of manufacture that includes computer code to allow a user to access a voice application and provide vocal input and to create a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with the vocal input. Silva does not teach, disclose, or suggest vocal interaction with a voice application to produce a bookmark. Thus, claim 23 is patentable over Silva for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-22 and 24-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Silva in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0146015 A1 (Bryan). Applicant respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Silva in view of Bryan.

Bryan is directed to generating and providing access to end-user-definable voice portals. The Examiner states that Bryan “discloses a method that saves a bookmark (audio macro) to a data source by accepting a vocal input (user speech) from a user (page 5, paragraph 64, lines 12-13, and paragraph 69).” Office Action, page 11, lines 4-6. In paragraph 69, however, Bryan reads that a template can be provided to a user to prompt the user for keywords for searching data sources “[o]nce an identifier has been assigned to the user, in step ST2.” Step ST2 allows the user to enter information into the template to select data sources and a word or phrase (the audio macro) that is easy for the user to remember in order to access the data sources. Paragraph 69, lines 7-10. Step ST2 is illustrated in FIG. 3 and clearly shows that the options available for data input by the user are to type words via the web or to speak words to an operator. Step ST2 in FIG. 3 shows that to define a tag (to indicate how the user is going to say a macro name), define a data source, or to define a macro, the user can speak a word or phrase to an operator, or can complete/type the word or phrase via a web-based template. Bryan thus discusses typing data or talking to an operator, not providing vocal input to a voice application, a more convenient technique than provided for by Bryan. In paragraph 64, Bryan discusses a media format translator 116 that may convert user input into another format, such as text. There is no discussion, however, as to how the translator 116 would interact with other components of Bryan’s system. There is no teaching that the translator 116 could be used to replace the human

operator to voice enable the complicated templates that are used by the human operator and shown in FIGS. 7-8.

Independent claim 10 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan. Claim 10 recites an apparatus for providing a user access to a voice application, the apparatus comprising a processor programmed to allow vocal input to a voice application and to create a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with the vocal input. Silva discusses using a graphical user interface to input data and Bryan discusses typing data via the web or speaking with an operator. Neither Silva nor Bryan, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or suggests creating a bookmark to a location in a voice application in accordance with vocal input to the voice application. Thus, independent claim 10 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 17, 22, and 23 are also patentable over Silva in view of Bryan. Claims 17, 22, and 23 recite features for creating/to create a bookmark to a location in the voice application in accordance with the vocal input. Thus, independent claims 17, 22, and 23 are patentable over Silva in view of Bryan for at least the reasons that claim 10 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan.

Independent claim 29 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan. Claim 29 recites a method for providing a bookmark in a voice application, the method comprising obtaining a voice response from a user, and creating the bookmark to a page of the voice application as indicated by the voice response of the user through the voice application. Neither Silva nor Bryan, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or suggests creating a bookmark to a page in a voice application if such a desire is indicated by a voice response through a voice application. Thus, independent claim 29 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan for at least these reasons.


Independent claims 31, 33, and 35 are also patentable over Silva in view of Bryan. Claims 31, 33, and 35 recite features for obtaining a voice response from a user and creating a bookmark to a page of a voice application if such a desire is indicated by the voice response. Thus, independent claims 31, 33, and 35 are patentable over Silva in view of Bryan for at least the reasons that claim 29 is patentable over Silva in view of Bryan.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-21, 24-28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 are also patentable over Silva in view of Bryan. Claims 2-9, 11-16, 18-21, 24-28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10, 17, 23, 29, 31, 33, and 35, respectively, and are

therefore patentable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 10, 17, 23, 29, 31, 33, and 35 are patentable over Silva in view of Bryan.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Shane H. Hunter  
Registration No. 41,858  
Attorneys for Applicants  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,  
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Telephone 617/348-1765  
**Customer No. 30623**

Date: November 17, 2004

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

In FIG. 2:

- add reference number 36 to the “D/A” box;
- remove reference number 36 from the line connected between the “CPU” and the “TCP/IP Stack”;
- add reference number 38 to the “Audio Out” line connected to the D/A 36;
- remove reference number 38 from the line running vertically through the center of the server 12 and connected to the bottom edge of the server 12;
- add reference number 40 to the “A/D” box;
- add reference number 42 to the “Audio In” line connected to the A/D 40;
- add reference number 44 to the “Telephony Interface” box connected to the line 46;
- add reference number 52 to the line connecting the telephony interface 52 and the remote host 14c.

These changes are reflected in a Replacement Sheet appended to this Response.